# EXHIBIT 1

| STATE OF NEW JERSEY  IN RE:  Of  CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE  DIGITEK LITIGATION  Place: Bergen Co. Justice Ctr. 10 Main Street Hackensack, NJ 07601  Date: March 27, 2009  BEFORE:  HONORABLE JONATHAN N. HARRIS, J.S.C.  TRANSCRIPT ORDERED BY:  YONATHAN ZLOCZEWSKI, PARALEGAL, (Harris Beach, PLLC, 100 Wall Street, New York, New York 10005) |  | SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY BERGEN COUNTY LAW DIVISION, CIVIL PART DOCKET NO. L-917-09 APP. DIV. NO. |
|---|--|---|
| 10 Main Street Hackensack, NJ 07601  Date: March 27, 2009  BEFORE: HONORABLE JONATHAN N. HARRIS, J.S.C.  TRANSCRIPT ORDERED BY: YONATHAN ZLOCZEWSKI, PARALEGAL, (Harris Beach, PLLC.  | IN RE:                                       | TRANSCRIPT of   |
| HONORABLE JONATHAN N. HARRIS, J.S.C.  TRANSCRIPT ORDERED BY:  YONATHAN ZLOCZEWSKI, PARALEGAL, (Harris Beach, PLLC.  |  | 10 Main Street<br>Hackensack, NJ 07601  |
| YONATHAN ZLOCZEWSKI, PARALEGAL, (Harris Beach, PLLC, 100 Wall Street, New York, New York 10005)   | HONORABLE JONATHAN N.                        | HARRIS, J.S.C.  |
|   | YONATHAN ZLOCZEWSKI,<br>100 Wall Street, New | PARALEGAL, (Harris Beach, PLLC,<br>York, New York 10005)  |

Transcriber Beverly Arato ELITE TRANSCRIPTS, INC. 14 Boonton Avenue Butler, NJ 07405 (973) 283-0196 Audio Recorded Operator, Paul A.

## ELITE TRANSCRIPTS, INC.

14 Boonton Avenue, Butler, New Jersey 07405 973-283-0196 FAX 973-492-2927

```
Case Management Conference
                                                            50
      just want you to be aware that there will be that
7
2
      significant document production in the near future.
3
                Now the other thing I would say, just give
 4
     you highlights of, we have -- we have worked I think in
5
      good cooperation with the plaintiffs' counsel in this
 6
      case, in a number of meet and confers, several in
7
      person and several by telephone.
8
                What we have focused on -- let me tell you
 9
      what we've focused on and what we have -- what we have
      not focused on simply because of time constraints.
10
11
      clearly have been focusing on issues on the protective
12
      order and on the plaintiff fact sheets and the
13
      defendant fact sheets.
14
                What we really have not addressed at -- in
1.5
      any significant depth, other than the barest of
      discussions is we have not really talked to each other
16
17
      about a case management order, a scheduling order.
      have not talked about electronic discovery.
18
19
      not talked about culling terms.
                                       We have not talked
20
      about preservation orders in any depth.
21
      obviously preservation orders are in place in the
22
      federal litigation.
23
                But just to give you a flavor of what we have
24
      done and what we have not done, that is I think the
25
      highlights of the discussions between us and
```

Case Management Conference 51 1 plaintiffs' counsel so far. There was a brief reference, let me just 2 3 comment for one minute, on tolling agreements. 4 taken the position that we would not engage or we would 5 not enter into an across the board broad brush set of 6 tolling agreements. 7 However, we have told plaintiffs' counsel if they get into a -- this -- This -- I guess it didn't 8 9 happen in this state but in other states there may be 10 statute of limitations issues coming up, and we have 11 told plaintiffs' lawyers that we have a group of cases 12 where you want to come to us, talk about specific cases 13 with the tolling agreement, we'll talk to you about 14 specific cases. 15 We don't want to do a broad across-the-board 16 agreement on tolling agreements. We would -- for 17 reasons as -- kind of similar to what you articulated, 18 we do see a value in knowing what the universe is and 19 getting -- getting that universe on file and knowing 20 what we're dealing with. 21 Then I think Ms. Relkin made brief reference 22 to the fact that -- you were talking about the testing 23 issue and whether any testing had been done. Relkin made reference to the fact that she had heard 24 25 that tests had been done where out of spec results came

```
Case Management Conference
                                                            52
     back.
1
2
                If indeed that has happened, nobody has -- no
3
     plaintiffs' lawyer has provided that to us.
      have done, Your Honor, is that we have -- many
4
5
     plaintiffs' lawyers understandably want to know whether
6
      they have any double-thick tablets.
7
                These are very small tablets, so just by --
 Я
      just to an untrained observer, it would be hard to tell
      whether they were double thick or not. So we have gone
9
10
      out to a number of plaintiffs' lawyers before who
11
      wanted us to come and weigh and measure their tablets
12
      to see if they had any double-thick tablets, all of
13
      this on an informal discovery track, nothing formal,
      and this is outside of New Jersey. I don't want -- I
14
15
      want to make that clear.
                We've visited probably the offices of 20
16
17
      different plaintiffs' lawyers. We have -- we have not
18
      yet seen any double-thick tablet.
                                         Now obviously you
19
      heard the statement made to you this morning, well, we
      may pursue a claim that a regular-size tablet without a
20
21
      specification, that is going to be an extremely
22
      difficult case to prove.
                Frankly, I think the best way, the only way
23
      really to prove that would be to test tablets and see
24
25
      what the results -- what the results were.
```

```
Case Management Conference
                                                             53
      litigation started out as, was at least generated,
 1
 2
      initial filings were generated by the concept or the
 3
      thought that they were double-thick tablets out on the
 4
      market.
 5
                We believe our records will demonstrate, and
 6
      obviously the plaintiffs have a right to look at them,
 7
      they don't have to take my word for it, but we -- we
 8
      believe that the only double-thick tablets were one lot
 9
      and that they were found before they were -- they were
10
      shipped to market.
11
                So the bottom line is we have not --
12
                THE COURT: Have you ever seen the double-
13
      thick --
14
                            No, I have not.
                MR. DEAN:
15
                THE COURT:
                            -- tablet?
16
                            I have not.
                MR. DEAN:
17
                THE COURT:
                             Is that like the upside down
18
      plane on the stamp, if you can find one, you're very --
19
                            Yeah, you've won -- you've won the
                MR. DEAN:
20
      big prize.
                  You asked a very --
21
                THE COURT:
                             Well, let me -- I apologize for
22
      interrupting.
23
                MR. DEAN:
                            Sure.
24
                THE COURT:
                             Have any plaintiffs' counsel seen
25
      this elusive double-thick tablet or any -- do you know
```

```
Case Management Conference
                                                             54
      of any experts who have, or doctors, or pharmacists,
 7
                                                             or
 2
      is it the quark?
                MR. WEINKOWITZ:
 3
                                 Your Honor, I'm not aware of
 4
      any -- that I have not looked at any tablets myself, so
 5
      I'm not aware of any.
                             I'm not aware of whether anybody
 6
      else has.
 7
                But double thick from our perspective, is a
 8
      red herring.
                    A pill can have more than or less than
 9
      the amount of the active ingredient in Digoxin even if
      it's not twice as thick, and indeed, the FDA recall and
10
11
      the announcement of the recall did -- went beyond just
12
      double-thick tablets to talk about dosing.
13
                So the defendants like to keep framing the
      issues double thick, double thick, double thick.
14
15
      could have a bunch of tablets on my table and none of
      them could be double thick but that's not the point.
16
                THE COURT:
17
                            Well, did -- did I hear you
      represent before or if it was Ms. Relkin, I forget,
18
19
      that there is forensic evidence, maybe incomplete and I
20
      appreciate that, that would suggest that at least one
21
      tablet somewhere, maybe more, whether it's double thick
22
      or not is beside the fact, it has out-of-specification
23
      dosage?
                MR. WEINKOWITZ:
24
                                  Well, I'll tell you exactly
25
      and Ellen can tell you what she heard.
                                               This is what I
```

```
Case Management Conference
                                                             55
 1
      have heard in telephone discussions about this case,
2
      that someone has done testing of the tab -- of Digitek
      tablets, I don't know whether there were a plaintiff's
3
 4
      or not a plaintiff's, I don't know that, and that there
 5
      have been -- what has been discovered is too much
 6
      Digoxin and too little Digoxin, outside of what I
 7
      understand is the variances that are allowed to -- that
 8
      the tablets are allowed to have.
 9
                That -- I heard that.
                                        I don't know who's
10
      done the testing.
                         I don't even know who --
11
                             Wouldn't that be something that
                THE COURT:
12
      I'm not suggesting you'd need that to file your
13
      lawsuit, far from it, but wouldn't that be something
14
      that you'd want to get your arms around as fast as
15
      possible?
                 Because if there are --
16
                MR. WEINKOWITZ:
                                  What I --
17
                THE COURT:
                             Because if there are other
18
      recognized ways of suffering Digoxin toxicity, it's a
      question of risk and benefit analysis of going forward
19
20
      with the lawsuit.
                          I'm not trying to talk you out of
21
      it, --
22
                MR. WEINKOWITZ:
                                  Right.
23
                             -- far from it, --
                THE COURT:
24
                MR. WEINKOWITZ:
                                  Right.
25
                THE COURT:
                             -- but I would think that if in
```

#### **ELITE TRANSCRIPTS, INC.**

```
Case Management Conference
                                                             56
      fact there is this what's now anecdotal evidence out
2
      there, plaintiffs would either want to urge me to get
3
      the plaintiffs right away to be able to do their own
      testing or collect from colleagues what this anecdotal
 4
5
      evidence is.
 6
                MR. WEINKOWITZ:
                                 And --
 7
                THE COURT: Don't take that as a criticism,
 8
      but --
9
                MR. WEINKOWITZ:
                                 No, no, I understand, and
      what I want as a plaintiff's lawyer to get my hands
10
      around is what happened at that plant that wasn't in
11
12
      FDA compliance, why were those pills recalled, what
13
      testing was done, how much, what did they find.
14
      understand the --
15
                THE COURT:
                            Well, I must say that sounds like
16
      the archetypical fishing expedition.
17
                MR. WEINKOWITZ: Well, Your Honor, I --
18
                THE COURT:
                            I mean, you could -- you could
19
      just as easily say about any drug manufacturer.
20
                MR. WEINKOWITZ: Yeah, but not any -- any
21
      drug manufacturers had --
22
                THE COURT:
                            Well, lots of people have adverse
23
      drug effects --
24
                MR. WEINKOWITZ: Yeah, but they didn't
25
      have --
```

| •   | Case Management Conference 57                           |
|-----|---|
| 1   | THE COURT: and they go a plaintiff's                    |
| 2   | lawyer and say gee, I had a bad incident here, test it, |
| 3   | oh, my God, you have Coumadin poisoning, well, now I    |
| 4   | want to go into the Coumadin plant, I want to check all |
| 5   | of their warfarin specifications.                       |
| 6   | I mean, it sounds absurd and silly, but I               |
| 7   | think you'd want a little bit more than you've got      |
| 8   | here. I'm not suggesting you're acting in bad faith     |
| 9   | but, you know, a lot of whispers are in the wind in     |
| 10  | this thing that don't really mean too much.             |
| 11  | MR. WEINKOWITZ: Your Honor, in the scenario             |
| 12  | I understand what you're saying in the scenario that    |
| 13  | you came in. There here we have an FDA recall           |
| 1.4 | involving tablets that had too much                     |
| 15  | THE COURT: I must tell you that I don't put             |
| 16  | much stock in an FDA recall as being anything.          |
| 17  | MR. WEINKOWITZ: And we have a plant that                |
| 18  | closed down and was cited twice for violations of good  |
| 19  | manufacturing process, and that plant has never opened  |
| 20  | back up, and in fact, the defendants had to recall all  |
| 21  | of their generic drugs other than Digoxin from that     |
| 22  | plant because of bad manufacturing process.             |
| 23  | So with with all due respect, I think here              |
| 24  | we have   |
| 25  | THE COURT: Well, if you think that you can              |

```
Case Management Conference
                                                             58
      convince a trier of the fact using that type of
 2
      circumstantial evidence, I think that you need to re-
 3
      think it, and I'm sure you wouldn't go to a jury with
      just that, you'd go to a jury with the specifics of the
 4
 5
                That's all I'm pointing out.
 6
                That ought to be something that plaintiffs
 7
      were to get -- get involved with sooner rather than
 8
              And I'm not suggesting, I'm not going to allow
 9
      what I'll call free-ranging discovery, but I think it's
10
      starting to sound, and I'm just beginning to learn the
11
      subtleties and I'm probably going to misapprehend them
      today, that it may ultimately be counterproductive if
12
13
      in fact every ounce, every dollar that goes into
      defense costs potentially makes smaller the potential
14
15
      pool of a settlement.
16
                You know, I think you really need to see what
17
      you've got rather than, you know, FDA did something,
18
      we're going to jump on that bandwagon.
                                               I mean, that
      could turn out to be a dead end. I don't want to hear
19
                        I want to get back to this.
20
      anymore of this.
21
                Mr. Dean.
22
                MR. DEAN:
                            Just a couple of more items, Your
23
      Honor.
              You asked a -- I think a question that really
24
      cuts to the heart of the litigation.
                                             The question you
25
      asked was -- of plaintiffs was is Digoxin toxicity
```

Case Management Conference 59 1 caused by oversized tablets. 2 Well, the answer to that is Digoxin toxicity could well be caused by oversized tablets but the 3 4 problem with the plaintiff, with the causation in this case is that Digoxin toxicity can also be caused by 5 6 absolutely perfectly normal tablets. 7 You can have a tablet that's absolutely to 8 specification and somebody can be taking it for let's 9 say six months and they can be fine today and then may 10 have a chance in their kidney function or may have a change in their metabolism and their Digoxin level can 11 12 go up not because anything is wrong with the tablet but 13 simply by what's happening within their body. 14 So their -- that, as you can appreciate, 15 makes proof of causation in a specific case unbelievably -- unbelievably difficult. So the answer 16 17 to your question could a double-sized tablet cause toxicity, I think if you took enough of them the answer 18 is yes, but the conundrum here is that if you took 19 20 perfectly normal tablets, under certain circumstances 21 you can also end up with Digoxin toxicity. 22 I think in the material we provided to Your 23 Honor we quoted from the package insert on -- on 24 Digitek and it basically says you've got to look at 25 what's going on in the patient, you can't be slandishly